

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2006. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, on page 2 of the Office Action, the disclosure is objected to based on a number of minor informalities that have been identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to correct the reference numerals used in the specification. For example, on page 14, lines 9 and 14, "bearing 128" has been changed to --bearing 124--. Also, in lines 9 and 15, "pulley 158" has been changed to --pulley 102-- in order to correct obvious informalities in the specification as originally filed. In view of the amendments to the specification, it is submitted that the objections thereto are now clearly obviated.

Further, the Examiner states that it appears that reference numeral "100" depicts a bearing. However, reference numeral 100 is intended to denote a drive member in Fig. 3. Accordingly, line 14 of page 14 has been amended to insert ---drive member--- before the number "100"; and Fig. 3 has been amended to correct the lead line from reference numeral 100. As you will see, in the attached "corrected" version of Fig. 3, the lead line from reference numeral 100 identifies the first drive member, which is consistent with the description in paragraph [0037].

In addition to the above changes, a number of other amendments have been made to the specification to improve the form thereof. To facilitate entry of the amendments to the specification, a substitute specification has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a "marked-up" copy of the original specification to show the changes that have been incorporated into

the substitute specification. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Further, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner questions how each of the first and second drive transfer systems can be connected to the first and second shafts. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to avoid reciting the first and second drive transfer systems. The claim now recites the particular features of the first and second drive transfer systems. Thus, the scope of the claim should now be clear.

Furthermore, the Examiner questions how the one way drive mechanism or a first clutch can be connected to a first and second shaft at the same time. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite that these features are operable to be connected to the associated elements. Accordingly, the claim does not specify that these features are connected to the first and second shafts, rather the claim language specifies that they are capable of being so connected.

Further, with respect to claim 4, "a ratchet" is no longer specified in the claim, thereby avoiding the Examiner's rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Finally, claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 19 to avoid the double inclusion of the prime mover.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-8 and 19-20 are clearly in compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Further, on pages 3-5 of the Office Action, claims 11-18 are rejected over the prior art. In response, claims 11-18 have been cancelled, thereby rendering moot the rejection of these claims over the applied prior art references.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As described above, each of the specific objections to claims 1-10 has been overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 4 and 7, and the cancellation of claim 9. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-8 and 19-20 are now clearly in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Roydon PUZEY

By: 

Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicant

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 7, 2006